

**Remarks:**

**1. Drawings.**

The reference character 300 designating a laser in figures 2 and 10 has been replaced by the reference character 308. This modification is believed to overcome the objection under 37CFR1.84(p)(4) as raised by the Examiner.

A figure 12 has been added which shows a wheel turning about an axis as recited in claim 11. This new figure is not new matter since the wheel is described in claim 11 and further in the original specification page 8 lines 7-9. It is submitted that figure 12 overcomes the objections under 37CFR1.83(a) as raised by the Examiner.

**2. Abstract.**

An Abstract has been provided in which the word “said” is not employed. It is submitted that this abstract overcomes the objection of the Examiner because the word “said” is not employed, and further respects other requirements concerning the Abstract.

**3. Specification.**

A Substitute Specification is appended herewith with a clean version and a version with markings. This Substitute Specification does not include any new matter.

The Examiner objected the Specification because it does not have a Summary of the Invention. The title “Description of the Invention” on page 3 line 4 of the original specification has been amended to “Summary of the Invention” since the contents of that part is in fact a summary of the invention. It is thus submitted that a “Summary of the Invention” is now provided with the appropriate subtitle, which is believed to overcome the objection of the Examiner concerning the absence of a Summary.

The following informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected as follows in the Substitute Specification:

- a) page 1 lines 11 and 15 the reference 300 now refers only to a lens. The words “originating from a point of the array 300” have been suppressed.
- b) page 2, line 4 “arrivreach” has been replaced by “reach”.
- d) page 9 line 17 “800” was replaced with “806”.

It is submitted that these corrections overcome the informalities (a) (b) (d) which correction was required by the Examiner.

The following informality was also mentioned by the Examiner:

- c) page 7 line 31 “figure 7” should, according to the Examiner, be changed to “figure 6”.

It is submitted that “figure 7” on page 7 line 31 effectively refers to figure 7 and not to figure 6. Figure 6 shows a single splitter unit and figure 7 shows, as mentioned in the Specification, a “multiple support 520” which is not shown on figure 6. It is submitted that the original text on page 7 line 31 is correct and therefore does not need to be modified.

Following the addition of figure 12 the following changes were made to the Specification:

A short description of added figure 12 was added in the “Brief description of the figures”.

Page 8 line 7-9 of the original specification was modified to introduce references to added figure 12.

The Specification was further amended to correct some grammatical and idiomatic errors and to make it easier to read.

**4. Claims.**

a) In claim 1 the Examiner pointed out that the claim language of Claim 1 is inaccurate because it comprises a broader range of limitation (for example “a plurality of illuminating beams”) and a narrower range (for example “an illuminating beam”). Claim 1 has been modified to maintain only the broader range. It is submitted that this modification overcomes the objection of indefiniteness as raised by the Examiner.

Further, the term “Confocal” on line 1 of claim 1 was changed to “A confocal” as suggested by the Examiner. The term “Characterised” on line 18 disappeared due to the modifications of the claim.

b) In claims 2, 4,5 the term “Optical” was changed to “The optical” as suggested by the Examiner.

c) In each of claims 6-11 the term “Device” was changed to “The optical device” as suggested by the Examiner.

d) In claim 9, “the optical path” which lacked antecedent basis was changed to “the plurality of illuminating beams”.

e) in claim 12 on line 1 “beamsplitter” has been changed to “The beamsplitter” as suggested by the Examiner. On line 5 “a first light beam” and “a second light beam” were changed to “the plurality of first beams” and “the plurality of second beams” in agreement with the changes made to claim 1 and with the remarks of the Examiner. On line 9 “a redirection mirror” was changed to “the redirection mirror” as suggested by the Examiner.

**Conclusion:**

It is submitted that the changes made to the application overcome the objections of the Examiner and that the application is now allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



By Vincent Lauer, applicant pro se.

# **DRAWINGS**